

under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WASHINGTON WASTE WATCHERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I, once again, want to speak a little bit on the cause the Washington Waste Watchers is trying to get done and that is to highlight and try to get rid of some of the everlasting waste in the Federal Government, waste of the taxpayer's money that the Federal Government seems so apt at doing so well.

Mr. Speaker, for example, the postal service managers received over \$500 million in incentive awards for allegedly improving financial performance when, in fact, all indicators showed at the same time that the financial performance had actually declined. And, yet, we still gave that \$500 million because of the performance which, again, the same performance had declined.

The examples are just never-ending. For example, the EPA had no knowledge whatsoever of the work that a certain EPA applicant was going to perform, but still awarded that same applicant with a \$700,000 grant even though it did not know what it was for, Mr. Speaker.

HUD paid the full amount of \$227,000, Mr. Speaker, for a project even though that same project that it was paying for, the full project, one-third of the project had only been completed. And, yet, the entire sum went out.

Again, no accountability whatsoever. And nothing seems to happen.

The public housing authority in Bridgeport, Connecticut, received an extra \$750,000 in operating subsidies during the year 2000, while incurring \$300,000, Mr. Speaker, in unnecessary utility expenses for units that had been vacant for years. Again, these are not new issues.

And, yet, the Democrats, Mr. Speaker, still insist on trying to raise the taxes of the hard-working American people to do more of this.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has grown at an uncontrollable size. And the Democrats insist on raising the taxes on the hard-working Americans to do more of this, of throwing good money after bad and bad money after good and good money after bad. Because it is not once, it is over and over and over. And their solution, Mr. Speaker, is it is not a prob-

lem, there is more money where that comes from.

The American people will take more money out of their hard-earned dollars, take it out of their pockets, send it to D.C. so D.C. can continue to do what it has done year after year after year.

I am encouraged, Mr. Speaker, by the President's new initiative to try to curtail this. But let me tell my colleagues what I am a little bit discouraged about, Mr. Speaker. The Federal Government loses almost \$20 billion before it can even waste it. When the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, had an amendment in the committee after we see the amount of money that is wasted, he said let's cut 1 percent, just 1 percent on waste, fraud and abuse. Mr. Speaker, how many votes were there from our distinguished friends of the Democratic party for the motion of the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to cut just 1 percent of waste, fraud and abuse? Zero. Not one. Because, again, they believe in raising taxes.

Take the money from the hard-working American people. They all keep sending it up here so they can come up and the money can come up here and the Federal Government can continue to waste it.

Mr. Speaker, again I will continue to highlight this waste. I am going to continue to thank the President for the initiatives that he has taken to change this, and we are going to continue to highlight it. And we have already filed some legislation, and we are going to file more legislation in order to try to change this culture of spending and of mispending to the culture of fiscal responsibility.

In the meantime, I would ask my friends in the other party to change their attitude from just asking for more money, for asking for more taxes and increases in taxes, and help us change this attitude that the President is trying to change, and we are going to continue to try to change.

PURCHASING PRESCRIPTION DRUGS FROM CANADA AND EUROPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, people from around the world come to America for their medical care. Yet Americans are forced to travel around the world for their prescription drugs and medications. Today, in the Washington Post, there was a poll conducted by the Washington Post and ABC News showing more than two-thirds of Americans think it should be legal to purchase medications from Canada and Europe and other industrialized nations.

I think this is significant given on the eve that the conference on prescription drugs is meeting to know where the American people are on the

major issue of allowing them to purchase medications from either Europe or Canada, allowing competition to pervade in the prescription drug area, allowing choice to consumers. Two-thirds of the Americans think it is the right thing to do.

In the meantime, millions of Americans are forced to either cut their medications in half, skip a month, forgo their prescription drugs entirely, or cut their pills, as I said, in half. Yet of those who choose not to do that, many are forced to go to Canada to buy their medications.

And what do our drug companies provide these seniors who are in dire need of life saving medications? Today, Eli Lilly announced joining other major companies like Glaxo, AstraZeneca, and Pfizer, they are going to begin to limit their sales to Canada, cut off their supplies to Canada. Rather than allowing competition and choice to exist in the system, these prescription drug companies are going to deny access to the Canadians where Americans get competitive prices.

You take the cancer drug Tamoxifen, \$360 in the United States; Canada, \$33. Life-saving medication for women with breast cancer. You go down the list, line by line. Last week, USA Today ran an article going line by line over major medications, and they were all somewhere between 40 to 50 percent cheaper in Canada than they are in the United States.

And the irony of all of that is many of those medications were developed with U.S. taxpayer dollars. So what have we provided? Not only do we fund the research and development of these new life-saving medications, we are provided the unique opportunity of paying the most expensive prices in the world for medications that were originally developed with U.S. tax dollars.

Many in the industry not only now are limiting sales, they argue about the safety of these medications purchased from Canada. Yet today, we import \$15 billion worth of medications from around the world. Nobody argues about their safety. And the most telling example about the issue of Canada is that in October 2000 when the United States Government needed a vaccine for anthrax, where did they turn because there was a shortage here in the United States?

□ 1945

They turned to Canada. If it was so unsafe for our consumers to go to Canada to buy medications, where did the United States Government go in dire need? They went to Canada because the system in Canada is comparable to our system.

A recent Wall Street Journal/Harris Interactive poll shows 77 percent of Americans believe it is unreasonable for pharmaceutical companies to take actions like Eli Lilly did today.

The facts are that the claims made by the FDA and the pharmaceutical companies about the dangers of these